

Leisure and the Economy

A.J. Veal
University of Technology, Sydney

Published as:

Veal, A. J. 2006, Leisure and the economy. In E. L. Jackson (ed.) *Leisure and the Quality of Life: Impacts on Social, Economic and Cultural Development: Hangzhou Consensus*, Zhejiang University Press, Hangzhou, China, pp. 119-127 (ISBN 7 894903000).

Introduction

Economists were among the first to analyse leisure. Foremost among them was Thorstein Veblen, whose *Theory of the Leisure Class*, published in 1899, was subtitled: *An Economic Study of Institutions*. In the second half of the twentieth century, one of the seminal texts in the study of leisure was *Economics of Outdoor Recreation*, by Marion Clawson and Jack Knetsch, published in 1962. Since that time there has been a steady stream of books and articles analysing the phenomenon of leisure from an economic point of view (see Veal, 2006 for a review). This mass of material covers a wide range of issues; here we concentrate on two only: 1. quantifying the economic significance of leisure; and 2. leisure and national economic development.

1. Quantifying the economic significance of leisure

The economic significance of leisure in the economy could be assessed using a variety of indicators, including data on: consumer expenditure on leisure; public sector expenditure on aspects of leisure, such as sport, outdoor recreation, the arts and tourism; employment in leisure industries; and special industry-specific studies. Ideally, data should be collected in a 'satellite account' as is done for tourism in some countries. Such an account would trace leisure expenditure throughout the economy and identify its contribution to Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The cost of establishing satellite accounts is, however, substantial and no example for leisure is known. The main data source used here is therefore the consumer expenditure surveys conducted in most developed economies.

Data on leisure are often collected in a fragmented way – for example arts, sport, tourism and outdoor recreation data each coming from different departments of government. Leisure is also often subsumed under other categories – for example, expenditure on gardening may not be distinguished from other 'household costs'. Gathering quantitative data on leisure is therefore rarely straightforward. These difficulties are compounded when attempting to view the phenomenon internationally, as a result of: language barriers; varying national systems for administering leisure and gathering data on it; and, in the case of poorer countries, the cost of collection and therefore the paucity of data.

While various examples exist of international compilations of data on leisure participation (eg. Cushman et al., 2005), no known example exists which provides information on the economic dimensions of leisure.

In this section of the paper data are presented on consumer expenditure and government expenditure. In the case of consumer expenditure, data have been assembled for nine countries for which the data were readily accessible. In the case of government expenditure

data are presented on two countries only.

Consumer expenditure

Most countries conduct consumer expenditure surveys on a regular basis as part of the process of establishing the consumer price index. The results typically include one or more leisure, recreation or culture categories which suggest that consumer expenditure on leisure is around 20 per cent of all consumer expenditure, but more detailed analysis indicates that a number of leisure expenditure items are often subsumed under other headings, such as housing (eg. expenditure on gardening or home entertaining), transport (leisure-related travel) or clothing (sporting/leisure clothing and footwear). When certain of these items are identified and included, leisure is seen to account for 25 per cent or more of consumer expenditure. It is, however, not always possible to separate out all relevant items, so most estimate of leisure expenditure are under-estimates.

Data for nine developed countries are presented in Appendix 1. Four technical points should be noted:

- These data have been compiled from published sources and without the benefit of resources to conduct detailed analysis so, inevitably, information from different countries is not strictly comparable; the exception is Table 1.6, which contains comparable data from four Nordic countries.
- Some data sources provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure categories, so that it is possible to identify leisure items within broader groupings, such as audio-visual equipment among household durables, but others do not.
- Leisure-related domestic travel is estimated at 30 per cent of all domestic travel expenditure – this proportion is based on surveys conducted in Australia,
- Where expenditure on meals purchased outside of the home is listed, an arbitrary 50 per cent is counted as leisure-related.

The summary in Table 1 shows that, as a proportion of all consumer expenditure, identified leisure expenditure varies from around 17 per cent in USA and Japan to around 28 per cent in UK and Sweden. However, given the variability in the data sources, it is likely that the actual proportions do not vary as much as this. Analysis with more detailed information would be likely to increase the proportions for those countries with the lower figures.

Table 1 also presents data on the estimated aggregate consumer expenditure on leisure which suggests, albeit on the basis of these variable measures and differing time periods, that the nine countries listed have a combined total of consumer expenditure on leisure of more than US\$1.3 trillion per annum. If the same ratio to GDP is applied to the 49 wealthiest countries (those with GDP per capita of over US\$10,000 per annum) a figure of US\$5.8 trillion is obtained as an estimate of aggregate annual consumer spending on leisure among the wealthiest countries in the world.

Table 1. Leisure expenditure and consumer expenditure in nine countries

Country	Leisure expenditure			
	as % of all consumer expenditure	\$US'000s per household per annum	No. of households, millions	Total, US\$ billions per annum
Australia	23.6	8.1	7.5	60.7
UK	28.1	9.3	24.7	229.7
USA	17.5	7.1	105.5	749.1
Japan	17.0	4.9	49.3	241.6
New Zealand	18.5	5.7	1.1	6.3
Norway	24.6	11.9	2.0	23.8
Sweden	22.8	9.9	2.5	24.7
Denmark	28.0	9.7	3.9	37.8
Finland	22.0	7.4	2.4	17.8

Source: see Appendix Tables 1.1-1.6

Public expenditure

Different aspects of public leisure programs (sport, arts, outdoor recreation, tourism, etc.) are generally administered by different layers of government and by different departments. Thus no one agency of government has an interest in the whole of leisure and so data are not compiled on overall government expenditure on leisure. Obtaining information on all government expenditure on leisure can therefore be a significant research challenge. In this paper, data are presented from two countries only: Australia and Great Britain, as shown in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2 indicates annual public sector expenditure of US\$6.4 billion in Australia, which is only eleven per cent of consumer expenditure on leisure, some three per cent of all government expenditure and about 1.2 per cent of GDP. More than half the total is spent on arts and heritage and a quarter on sport and recreation. Table 3, on Great Britain, provides less detail on categories of expenditure but provides trend data over the 1990s. The overall expenditure figure of US\$4.1 billion is lower than Australia's, despite a population three times the size, but only government agencies are included at national level, not direct government expenditure. The trend shows an increase of some 18 per cent over an eight year period, which is a compound rate of less than two per cent per annum - so in real terms, expenditure fell.

Thus, despite its apparent significance in absolute terms, government expenditure is economically relatively insignificant and does not always find favour with governments seeking to control public expenditure. Nevertheless, the range of services and amenities which this expenditure supports – including cultural and environmental heritage, sport, the arts, public open space and broadcasting – can be seen to be socially and environmentally highly significant

Table 2: Public sector leisure expenditure by level of government, Australia

	Federal	State/ Territory	Local government	Total
	US\$m	US\$m	US\$m	US\$m
<i>Heritage, 2003-04</i>				
Art galleries	33.4	116.7	na	na
Museums	147.8	237.1	na	na
National Parks etc.	50.2	717.6	na	na
Zoological parks, aquaria & botanic gardens	5.4	92.4	na	na
Libraries and archives	84.7	260.7	na	na
<i>Total Heritage</i>	321.4	1424.5	565.8	2311.8
<i>Arts, 2003-04</i>				
Literature & print media	20.4	3.3	na	na
Performing arts	76.9	58.3	na	na
Performing arts venues	0.7	105.5	na	na
Visual arts & crafts	7.8	12.2	na	na
Broadcasting & film	739.3	46.0	na	na
Community cultural centres & activities	8.8	9.3	na	na
Administration of culture	26.4	30.1	na	na
Other arts	38.8	31.0	na	na
<i>Total Arts</i>	919.2	295.5	124.1	1338.8
<i>Total Arts & Heritage</i>	1240.6	1720.0	689.9	3650.5
<i>Sport & Recreation, 2000-01</i>				
Administration, policy & planning	21.8	54.2	27.2	103.1
Regulation & control	29.0	14.8	3.4	47.2
Venues, grounds & facilities	10.6	135.6	299.4	445.6
Recreation parks and waterways	-	68.9	428.8	497.7
Participation by clubs, teams & individuals	1.8	48.9	4.7	55.4
Special events	56.2	273.7	-	329.9
Horse & dog racing	-	16.4	-	16.4
Coaching & training	17.8	19.3	-	37.2
Other support services	8.2	7.0	3.1	18.3
<i>Total Sport & Recreation</i>	145.2	638.9	766.6	1550.7
<i>Other Recreation and Culture</i>	194.6	-	525.5	720.1
<i>Tourism, 2003-04</i>	42.9	374.5	73.0	490.3
Total	1623.3	2733.4	2055.0	6411.6

Source: Lynch and Veal, 2006, Table 6.7

Table 3. Public sector leisure expenditure, Great Britain, 1991-92 – 1999-2000

	Local government	National agencies ¹	Total
	US\$m	US\$m	US\$m
1991-92	2977.4	484.5	3461.8
1992-93	3074.0	537.5	3611.5
1993-94	3041.2	555.8	3597.0
1994-95	3082.6	484.7	3567.3
1995-96	3174.1	488.5	3662.6
1996-97	3339.8	475.7	3815.5
1997-98	3343.3	477.6	3820.8
1998-99	3469.3	482.6	3951.8
1999-00	3565.9	537.5	4103.4

Source: Adapted from Henry (2001: 75).

The largest single body of research literature in the economics of leisure is concerned with analysis of the public sector – particularly development of rationale for public expenditure in the area. This research draws on welfare economics and involves cost-benefit studies of public expenditure in outdoor recreation, the arts and sport. Invariably these studies show that the public subsidy provided produces a substantial return in the form of public benefits, many of which can be quantified, using techniques such as the travel cost or 'Clawson' method to estimate user benefits and contingency or 'willingness-to-pay' methods for estimating both user benefits and non-user benefits. This research is concerned with the micro-economics of markets – or pseudo-markets – for individual products or services, which is not the primary concern of this paper. Here we are focussed on the macro-economics of leisure and the economy – involving such matters as the level of GDP, employment and unemployment – although, of course, individual products and services collectively make up the aggregate leisure market and therefore play a role in 'leisure and the economy'.

Employment in leisure

Countries vary in their occupational and industry classification systems and therefore in the extent to which employment in the full range of leisure industries can be identified. Table 4. presents data from Australian only. It shows a total of 720,000 employed in the leisure industries, which is 0.7 per cent of all employment in Australia.

Industry studies

In a number of countries ad hoc studies have been conducted of the economic scale of particular leisure industries or sectors – notably the arts and sport – and their impacts on local, regional and national economies. Typically such studies are designed to raise the profile of the industry sector in the eyes of the public and governments in pursuit of continued or additional funding from the latter. Examples of such studies are listed in Table 5.

2. Leisure and economic development

Such literature as there is on leisure and economic development generally deals with either tourism as a source of economic development in developing countries or tourism, sport and the arts/culture as vehicles for urban regeneration in developed economies. Following a very brief summary of the broad conclusions of this literature, the discussion here focusses on a number of issues which have been neglected in the literature, namely:

- a. the relationship between the quality of life and increasing leisure spending (private and public) resulting from increasing wealth, arising from economic development, including the question of the balance between work-time and leisure time;
- b. the role of leisure-related multi-national corporations in economic development; and
- c. the pattern of distribution of wealth and leisure benefits across the community in the context of economic development.

Table 4. Employment in the leisure industries, Australia, 2000

Sector	Employees
Cultural industries	
Publishing*	22880
Film/video production/distribution	4370
Motion picture exhibition	10070
Radio and television	24520
Music and theatre	10820
Creative arts	9340
Arts support services	5640
Libraries	11460
Museums	5410
Other libraries, arts, museums	970
Photographic studios	4870
Other cultural industries	24750
Sport and recreation	
Parks and gardens	10330
Horse & dog racing	11375
Boat building	7760
Sports grounds & facilities	26100
Sports/sport services	31570
Social/entertainment activities	
Clubs	44885
Pubs, bars	26600
Cafes and restaurants*	59425
Casinos	10940
Other gambling	13875
Tourism-specific	
Travel agencies & tour operators	23600
Accommodation	92800
Transport (tourism)	65300
Education related to tourism	23900
Other	
Government administration	3840
Other leisure employment	131500
Total	718900

Data source; Lynch and Veal, 2006, Table 6.2. * includes half of all employment in this sector

Table 5. Studies of the economic significance of leisure

Arts	Casey, Dunlop & Selwood, 1996	UK
	Myerscough (1988)	UK
	Heilbrun and Gray (2001)	USA
Sport	DASETT (1988)	Australia
	Henley Centre for Forecasting (1986)	UK
	Leisure Industries Research Centre (1997)	UK
	Jones (1990)	Europe
Tourism	Weaver and Oppermann (2000)	Australia & International
	World Tourism Organization (Annual)	International

Tourism as a source of economic development in developing countries

While the bulk of international tourism traffic is between developed countries, as tourist generators and hosts, a significant, and growing, proportion involves tourists from developed economies visiting destinations in developing countries. Since tourism, in effect, provides export income for the host country, this is generally seen as positive for economic development. Research has, however, highlighted some negative aspects of the phenomenon, for example:

- the fact that tourism development involves a large proportion of unskilled, low paid and often seasonal jobs, and that locals may not even have access to many of the more skilled and high paid jobs because of lack of training and experience - of course unskilled, low paid and often seasonal jobs may be preferable to even lower paid pre-existing jobs, or no jobs at all, but the scope for local *development* may be limited;
- investment, and therefore ownership, control and profits, are generally in the hands of non-local - even foreign - individuals or corporations, again limiting local development benefits;
- the attraction of labour to the tourism industry can disrupt existing rural economies;
- lack of administrative infrastructure, and/or corruption, can result in unacceptable levels of environmental damage.

Of course such problems are not unique to tourism development and even with these problems, the net balance of benefits and costs arising from tourism development may still be seen as positive.

Tourism, sport and the arts/culture and urban regeneration in developed economies

In the post-industrial world, urban policy-makers have looked to service industries, and in particular tourism and sports and arts events, as vehicles for economic development, particularly the regeneration of depressed inner city areas. Some of this activity, often associated with civic 'boosterism', has been focussed on the redevelopment of city docklands (Craig-Smith and Fagence, 1995) and some with major events such as expos and the Olympic Games (Syme et al. 1989; Roche, 2000; Preuss, 2004). In the United States the commercial sport team or franchise and associated stadium has been a common vehicle (Noll & Zimbalist, 1997).

There is a considerable and growing research literature on the process of evaluating these types of development to determine the extent to which they are cost-effective. As with the analysis of tourism in developing countries there are negative as well as positive aspects to such developments, some of them the same, given that tourism is a key component of the economic viability of most developments. Thus, in cities where manufacturing industry has declined, leisure industry jobs typically cannot match the wage levels and job security once offered by the declining or defunct industries. Further, because events are typically short-term (although some, such as annual arts festivals, may occur on a regular basis), if they are to form the basis for on-going economic development they must: be pursued as part of an on-going, year-round, events program; spawn other industries, such as creative/artistic enterprise or ancillary providers of equipment and services; or attract unrelated 'footloose' industries to locate in the city, through their development of infrastructure and an attractive image for the city. Finally, while it is clearly the case that whole regional economies can develop successfully on the basis of leisure-related industries, the market for leisure services, as with any commodity, is finite. As more and more cities develop leisure infrastructure which

depends on visitor income for viability, the chance of imbalances between supply and demand – and therefore the potential failure of projects – increases.

Quality of life, income and leisure

The above two discussions of development issues have focussed on leisure as investment and generator of economic development. Economic development involves increasing levels of investment and consumption. With the decline of the eastern European communist bloc and the embracing of market processes in China, a broad consensus exists in the world that such investment requires a mix of public sector and private sector involvement.

As far as the private sector is concerned, the first part of the paper suggests that a wide range of leisure goods and services which consumers buy with the intention of enhancing their quality of life² are universally provided by the private sector. The current consensus among economists is that if this process is to be successful, the role of governments should be minimal, providing a sound legal and monetary framework. However, governments also have a role to play in provision of services. Government outlays account for between a third of GDP (Japan) and more than half (most of Scandinavia) (Tiffen and Gittens, 2004: 88).

While mainstream economics is largely concerned with market processes and their ability to deliver goods and services efficiently, it nevertheless prescribes a role for governments. Adam Smith, the 'father' of modern economics, outlined three essential roles for governments:

.. first, the duty of protecting the society from the violence and invasion of other independent societies; secondly, the duty of protecting, as far as possible, every member of the society from the injustice or oppression of every other member of it, or the duty of establishing an exact administration of justice; and, thirdly, the duty of erecting and maintaining certain public works and certain public institutions, which it can never be for the interest of any individual, or small number of individuals, to erect and maintain; because the profit could never repay the expense to any individual or small number of individuals, though it may frequently do much more than repay it to a great society. (quoted in Friedman & Friedman, 1979: 49)

American economist and free market proponent Milton Friedman added a fourth, namely: 'the duty to protect members of the community who cannot be regarded as 'responsible' individuals' (Friedman & Friedman, 1979: 53), meaning children and the mentally ill or handicapped.

It is in the third category, 'maintaining certain public works and certain public institutions', that the bulk of public sector involvement with leisure occurs. The range of such involvement is potentially very wide, as the list in Table 2 indicates. Further, the demand for resources in these areas of 'market failure' is almost limitless. So how are governments to determine the appropriate areas for provision and expenditure and the appropriate levels of provision and expenditure? Again, mainstream economics provides a range of theoretical and practical criteria and processes for making such decisions. The grounds for public intervention, such as 'public good', 'merit good' and 'externality' arguments, are well developed in the general economic literature and the specialist leisure, arts, sport and protected area literature (see Veal, 2002: 53-72 for summary). Cost-benefit studies are the practical application of these theoretical ideas, designed to justify public expenditure in the context of a market economy.

As indicated above, invariably, such studies provide ample justification for existing or proposed public investments in the area.

However, research to date has been ad hoc and piecemeal: single projects with specific costs producing a specific set of benefits. What is missing from the research literature is any assessment of the balance of costs and benefits for the complete range of public leisure services and their contribution to the quality of life of a community. On the other side of the argument, defenders of the market point to issues of 'government failure', in the inability of governments to use resources efficiently, and the threat of high levels of public expenditure and associated taxation placing restraints on the successful growth of private markets which do, after all, also provide essential services. But if an appropriate balance is to be found, this debate should ideally be engaged from both sides – that is with macro-level arguments for provision to counter the macro-level arguments for restraint.

In their 1991 paper on 'Leisure resources, recreation activity, and the quality of life', Robert Marans and Paul Mohai noted;

Research aimed at understanding the role of leisure in life quality has measured either active and passive recreational pursuits, family and friendship patterns, or voluntary activity: but few studies have considered a full spectrum of behaviors that could be construed as leisure. There is a need to systematically sort out the various components of leisure identified in the literature and explore their interactions and substitutability vis-a-vis quality of life within the context of a single study. (Marans and Mohai, 1991: 360)

Marans and Mohai refer to 'few studies' – it was then, and is still now, more accurate to say that there have been *no* such studies. The nearest the leisure studies community has come in the intervening years to considering this idea has been in the development of the field of cultural planning (Evans, 2001), but the empirical basis for this is also fragmented.

Clearly, different countries and different cities have, generally by historical accident, ended up with different levels and mixes of public leisure provision. What impact do these different scenarios have on the quality of life of residents? What are the successful and less successful models of development? If the answers to such questions were known, it would be possible to advise those responsible for current and future development – in wealthy and poor countries – on the various levels and mixes of public investment in leisure and their likely impacts on the future quality of life of the community. Addressing such questions poses an enormous challenge for the leisure studies community.

Notes

1. Over the period there were changes in agency responsibilities which affect expenditure levels, and some missing data. In one case, the Countryside Agency, the expenditure figure for 1995/96 has been assumed for subsequent years.
2. Although indulgence in some activities, such as smoking tobacco and consuming narcotics, and over-indulgence in others, such as eating, drinking or gambling, can have negative impacts on quality of life.

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2005) *Household Expenditure Survey: Australia – Detailed Expenditure Items, 2003-04*. (Cat. No. 6535.0), ABS, Canberra.
- Clawson, M. and Knetsch, J. L. (1962) *Economics of Outdoor Recreation*. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore.
- Craig-Smith, S. J. and Fagence, M. (eds) (1995) *Recreation and Tourism as a Catalyst for Urban Waterfront Redevelopment: A International Survey*. Praeger, Westport, CN.
- Cushman, G., Veal, A.J., & Zuzanek, J. (eds) *Free Time and Leisure Participation: International Perspectives*. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK (includes data on 15 countries).
- Casey, B., Dunlop, R. and Selwood, S. (1996) *Culture as Commodity? The Economics of the Arts and Built Heritage in the UK*. Policy Studies Institute, London.
- Department of the Arts, Sport, the Environment, Tourism and Territories (DASETT) (1988) *The Economic Impact of Sport and Recreation – Household Expenditure*. Technical Paper No. 1, AGPS, Canberra.
- Evans, G. (2001) *Cultural Planning: An Urban Renaissance?* Routledge, London.
- Friedman M. and Friedman R. (1979) The role of government. In *Free to Choose*. Penguin, Harmondsworth, Middx.: 47-58.
- Gratton, C., Dobson, N. and Shibli, S. (2000) The economic importance of major sport events: a case-study of six events. *Managing Leisure*, 5(1), 17-28.
- Heilbrun, J., and Gray, C. M. (2001) Estimating the size of the arts sector. in *The Economics of Art and Culture*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 7-10.
- Henley Centre for Forecasting (1986) *The Economic Impact and Importance of Sport in the UK*. Study 30, Sports Council, London.
- Jones, H. (1990) The economic impact and importance of sport: a Council of Europe co-ordinated study. *Sport Science Review*, 13, 26-31.
- Leisure Industries Research Centre (1997) *A Review of the Economic Impact of sport. report to the Sports Council*. Sheffield, Leisure Industries Research Centre, Sheffield Hallam University.
- Lynch, R. and Veal, A. J. (2006) *Australian Leisure, 3rd edn*. Pearson Education, Sydney.
- Marans, R. W., & Mohai, P. (1991) Leisure resources, recreation activity, and the quality of life. In B. L. Driver, P. J. Brown and G. L. Peterson (eds) *Benefits of Leisure*. Venture, State College, PA; 351–64.
- Martin, W.H. and Mason, S. (1998) *Transforming the Future: Rethinking Free Time and Work*. Leisure Consultants, Sudbury, Suffolk.
- Myerscough, J. (1988) *The Economic Importance of the Arts in Britain*. Policy Studies Institute, London.
- Noll, R. G. and Zimbalist, A. (eds) (1997) *Sports, Jobs and Taxes: The Economic Impact of Sports Teams and Stadiums*. Brookings Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Office for National Statistics (2006) *Family Spending: A Report on the 2004-05 Expenditure and Food Survey*. ONS, London.
- Preuss, H. (2004) *The Economics of Staging the Olympic Games: A comparison of the games, 1972-2008*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- Roche, M. (2000) *Mega-events and Modernity: Olympics and Expos in the Growth of Global Culture*. Routledge, London.
- Syme, G. J., Shaw, B. J., Fenton, M. D. and Mueller, W. S. (eds) (1989) *The Planning and Evaluation of Hallmark Events*. Avebury, Aldershot, UK.
- Tiffen, R., and Gittens, R. (2004) *How Australia Compares*. Cambridge University Press, Melbourne.

- Veal, A. J. (2002) *Leisure and Tourism Policy and Planning*. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK.
- Veal, A. J. (2006, forthcoming) The economics of leisure. In C. Rojek, S. Shaw and A. J. Veal (eds) *Handbook of Leisure Studies*. Palgrave, Basingstoke.
- Veblen, T. (1899) *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, (1970 edn). London, Allen and Unwin
- Weaver, D., and Oppermann, M. (2000) The economic impacts of tourism. In *Tourism Management*, John Wiley, Brisbane: 247-81.
- World Tourism Organization (Annual) *Enzo Paci Papers on the Economic Significance of Tourism*. Madrid, WTO.

Appendix 1. Consumer expenditure on leisure, selected countries

Table 1.1. Australia: Household expenditure on leisure, 2003-04

	Expenditure per household in year 2003-04, US\$
Alcoholic drink	
Beer	361
Wine	247
Spirits	167
Other	135
Total alcoholic drink	909
TV/audio/computers	
Television	243
Radio/Audio equipment	49
VCR/Video equipment	119
Home entertainment systems	52
Computer equipment/internet	232
Internet fees	37
Video cassettes/discs	89
CDs and tapes(audio)	64
TV games and computer software	52
Other TV etc.	14
Total TV, audio, computers	952
Books/newspapers/magazines	0
Books	154
Newspapers	100
Magazines and comics	70
Other printed material	5
Total books/newspapers/magazines	329
Gambling	0
Lottery tickets	12
Lotto/instant lotteries	137
TAB, on course betting and related	4
Poker machines and ticket machines	30
Other gambling	31
Total gambling	214
Holidays	0
Holidays - Australia	805
Holidays - overseas	548
Total holidays	1354
Pets	358
Recreational equipment	0
Photographic	107
Sunglasses (excl. prescription)	18
Musical instruments	26
Boat purchase, parts and operation	50
Swimming pools & landscaping	236
Toys	91
Camping equipment	13
Sports equipment	116
Garden goods	205
Travel goods	60
Hire and repair of equipment	21
Other recreational equipment	61

Total recreation equipment	792
Entertainment/recreation services	0
Sport/fitness charges	227
Sport spectator fees	28
Cinema admission	75
Theatre admissions	62
Dances/nightclubs	21
National parks/zoos	8
Art galleries/museums	6
Club/association subscriptions	27
Culture/recreation lessons	62
Other cultural fees/charges	2
Day trips and other excursions	25
Amusement arcade machines	2
Other Recreation services	84
Total entertainment/recreation services	630
Meals out	740
Transport (30% of all transp exp.)	1629
Total leisure expe	8120
Total household expenditure	34455
Leisure as % of total expenditure	23.6

Data source: Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2005

Table 1.2. UK: Household expenditure on leisure, 2004-05

	Expenditure per household in year 2004-05, US\$
Alcoholic drink	
Spirits, liqueurs consumed at home	109
Wines consumed at home	300
Beer consumed at home	164
Other consumed at home	9
Alcoholic drinks away from home	774
Total alcoholic drink	1356
Audio-visual, photographic & information	
Audio equipment/accessories, CD players	191
TV, video, computers	555
Photographic, cine& optical equipment	64
Total audio-visual etc.	810
Newspapers, books, magazines	
Books	146
Newspapers	182
Magazines	100
Total newspapers, books etc.	428
Gambling	346
Package holidays and accommodation*	
In UK	300
Abroad	1338
Total package holidays/accommodation	1638
Pets	282
Recreational equipment	
Games, toys, hobbies	209
Computer software/games	100
Sport, camping, open air	118
Garden	237
Diaries, address books, cards etc.	191
Total recreational equipment	855
Recreational, cultural services	
Sports admissions, subscriptions, fees	455
Cinema, theatre, museums admissions	191
TV, video, satellite, cable, Internet, licences	501
Photographic	36
Miscellaneous entertainments	91
Total recreational, cultural services	1274
Meals out	1128
Transport (30% of total travel)	1629
Total leisure	9318
Total expenditure	33188
Leisure as % of total	28.1

Data source: Office for National Statistics, 2006 * Independent travel included in transport.

Table 1.3 USA: Consumer expenditure, 2003

	Expenditure per household in 2003 US\$
Alcoholic beverages	391
Food away from home	2211
Entertainment	2060
Reading	127
Transport (30% of total)	2334
Leisure	7123
Non-leisure	33694
Total consumer expenditure	40817
Leisure as %	17.5

Source: US Consumer expenditure survey 2003 via Bureau of Labor Statistics website: www.bls.gov/cex/#data

Table 1.4. Japan: Household expenditure, 2004

	Expenditure per household in 2003 US\$
Eating out (50% of total)	608
Alcoholic beverages	298
Transportation & communication (30% of total)	1046
Recreational durable goods	285
Recreational goods	578
Books & other reading materials	440
Hotel charges	135
Package tours	432
Lesson fees	299
Other recreational services	740
Total leisure	4862
Total household 'living' expenditure	28576
%	17

Data source: Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications, Statistics Branch: family Income and expenditure Survey, 2004, via website: www.stat.go.jp/english/data/kakei/index.htm

Table 1.5. New Zealand: household Expenditure, 2003-04

	Expenditure per household in 2003 US\$
Meals away from home, ready-to-eat food (50%)	635
Overseas travel	956
Transport in NZ (30%)	1186
Alcohol	707
Pets, racehorses and livestock	248
Publications, stationery etc.	573
Leisure and recreational goods	566
Recreational vehicles	97
Leisure services	707
Total leisure exp.	5676
Total household Expenditure	30658
Leisure as % of total	18.5

Data source: NZ household Economic Survey, 2003-04, Statistics New Zealand, Wellington, via website: www.stats.govt.nz/datasets/work-income/household-economic-statistics.htm

Table 1.6. Nordic countries: household expenditure

	Norway	Denmark	Sweden	Finland
	2003	2002	2003	2001
Expenditure per household, US\$				
Alcoholic Beverages and Narcotics*	1051	1153	734	713
Transport & Communication (30%)	2867	2079	2306	1847
Recreation and Culture	6085	4728	5255	3312
Restaurants and Hotels	1889	1832	1443	1525
Total Leisure	11892	9791	9737	7398
Total Exp.	48334	42897	34789	33554
Leisure As %	24.6	22.8	28.0	22

Data source: Statistics Sweden, web-site: www.scb.se/templates/Product_22952.asp

* Original grouping: Alcoholic Beverages. Tobacco and Narcotics - 75% of this figure included here.